

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 803

FL 019 473

AUTHOR Quirk, Randolph
TITLE The Question of Standard in the International Use of English.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 13p.; In: Tickoo, Makhan L., Ed. Languages & Standards: Issues, Attitudes, Case Studies; see FL 019 461.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries;
*Language Standardization; *Models
IDENTIFIERS *Language Spread

ABSTRACT

This paper presents three models on "language spread," or three ways in which human language may be spread. These models include: (1) the demographic spread, in which language spread is caused and accompanied by population spread; (2) the econocultural model, exemplified by the spread of English in the world of multinational business; and (3) the imperial model, which reflects political domination with only sufficient population movement to sustain an administrative system and power structure. It is concluded that the remarkable degree of the current spread of English in the world can be attributed to the econocultural model, and, that, for countries affected by the imperial model, it is likely that a long-term demand for English will be related equally to econocultural factors, with consequences accordingly for the standards to be observed. (JL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

I THE QUESTION OF STANDARD IN THE INTERNATIONAL USE OF ENGLISH

Randolph Quirk

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Chow

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED347803

FL019473

Most traditionally and endemically, language spread is caused and accompanied by population spread. Gujarati is spoken in England because groups of Gujarati - speaking immigrants have settled there. English is spoken in New Zealand because English - speaking immigrants settled there. I shall call this the 'demographic' model.

But language spread may reflect the spread of ideas without much population movement. This is how, centuries after the fall of Rome, Latin became the language of learning throughout Western and Northern Europe for more than a thousand years. There are analogies in the spread of Arabic as the vehicle of Islam (as distinct from its spread as the language of ethnic Arabs). There are analogies today in the spread of scientific information, computer technology, and indeed pop music, through the medium of English. Under this head too comes the spread of English in the conduct of multinational business in firms like Philips or Shell Petroleum. I shall call this the 'econocultural' model.

Third, language spread may reflect political domination with only sufficient population movement to sustain an administrative system and power structure. For example, German was used far and wide throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire in administering all or part of what is now Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia. (Only in 1868 were the Poles of Galicia allowed to use Polish as an official language or Amtsprache.) In ancient times, this was the model too for the thin but powerful spread of the administrative languages wielded by the Greek and subsequently by the Roman Empire. It is the pattern for the spread of English in much but not all of the British Empire: and still to be found (until 1997) in Hong Kong. This third type can appropriately be labelled the 'imperial' model, though it must be noted that we are using the notion of empire rather generically and abstractly, since this same model is evinced in the spread of Russian throughout the USSR, notably in the non-Slavonic republics.

I should like to look a little more closely at each of these three models in turn.

1. The demographic model. Now, although I studiously avoid in this label any implication of ethnicity, still less of nationality, we can never ignore the power of language as one of the prime bases of nationhood. Between 1800 and 1940, as Fishman (1982) reminds us, no fewer than three dozen new standard languages were recognized in Europe alone, resulting from the growth of nationalist

movements that in turn resulted in such 'new' polities as Finland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. From the intensity of nationalism beyond Europe, especially during the past thirty or forty years, came the recognition of analogous linguonational identities to be numbered not by the dozen but by the hundred.

Nonetheless, while nationhood realized through a single language is widely regarded as ideal ('Demographic Model A', let us call it), it appears to be rather rare in literal practice. Among major countries, perhaps Japan comes closest. More usually, we have the 'Demographic Model B', which results in multilingual nations--whether small, such as Switzerland and Singapore, or large, such as Indonesia, Nigeria, and the United States.

A less common product of demography-led language spread is the emergence of countries, politically separate but sharing a language. This 'Demographic Model C' includes examples as various as Arabic in Morocco, Egypt, Iraq, and elsewhere (cf. Ibrahim and Jernudd 1986); Chinese in China, Taiwan and Singapore; English in Britain, the United States, Australia; Spanish in Spain, Ecuador, and Chile (cf. Guitarte and Quintero 1974); Dutch in Holland and Belgium; French in France, Belgium, and Switzerland. Here is where the nation-specific variety of a language presents itself most readily as the vehicle for the printed and electronic media, in government, and in education. But of course, the formulation of the nation-model, its institutionalisation, varies enormously between, say, Iraqi Arabic, American English, and British English at one extreme; in contrast with New Zealand English, Argentinian Spanish, Peruvian Spanish, etc; not to mention 'Belgian Dutch' or 'Swiss French', where resistance to recognising an indigenous standard is very strong. We note, too, the promotion of Pūdōnghua, not only in China but (as Mandarin) in Taiwan and Singapore (cf. Kuo 1985, Jernudd 1986).

Linguists would do well to study the kind of variation arising through Demographic Model C and the sociopolitical dynamic that promotes it. We cannot attribute the difference to size, power, or geographical remoteness alone. These might seem to account for America's self-confidence in recognising an American English in contrast to New Zealand's relative modesty of linguistic independence. But there are counterexamples with Portuguese in vast, populous Brazil in contrast to what a few settlers in South Africa did in boldly evolving Afrikaans from their Cape Dutch. This last instance is perhaps of special interest: a new standard language appropriates the name of the country, thus seeming to expose other inhabitants -- black, brown, and pink -- as being immigrants, a policy neatly endorsed by referring to them with such labels as Bantu and English, the latter not just speaking English but being English, their language having its standard rooted not in the courts, churches, and classrooms of Johannesburg, but in London W1, as any listener to SABC is constantly reminded (cf. Lanham 1982). For the 'verkrampste', the only 'Africans' in South Africa are the Afrikaners, speaking Afrikaans.

2. **The econocultural model.** While the demography model is relevant in some degree to all languages, and among them the spread of English is no more remarkable than several others, the 'econocultural' model of language spread applies in our time more to English than to any other language. The only remotely relevant comparator in Western history is Latin: not Latin through imperial rule, but Latin introduced much later as the vehicle of religion, medicine, science, culture, and retained for a thousand unchallenged years. (Cf. Kahane and Kahane 1979, Kahane 1986.) Moreover, where the demography-led extension of English is in recent decades so modest as to be regarded as effectively in stasis, the extension of spread by econocultural motivation (appropriately called the 'expanding circle' by Kachru, cf. 1985c) has been almost exponential over the past forty years, and such growth seems set to continue for the rest of the millennium.¹ It constantly raises questions relating to standards -- questions in which, I suppose, everyone attending the present Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics has been involved. Oversimplifying, these questions concern two broad areas, the general (2.1) and the restricted (2.2).

2.1 The general area. In the general area, we are concerned mainly with the authorities responsible for setting standards in the education systems. Here, again oversimplifying, we have seen, and will doubtless continue to see, a shift in orientation from British English to American English. The political or regional labels retain their relevance for the very reason that we are primarily concerned with education systems which combine a language-teaching interest with what the Germans call a Landeskunde interest. But in my own experience, the issue that worries education ministers is not the choice between American and British standards but (1) what they detect as an increasing unwillingness or inability to identify standards in America or Britain, and (2) what they infer from the false extrapolation of English 'varieties' by some linguists. Thus in Japan last September, I was asked in Mombusho whether it was my view that Japanese learners were incapable of mastering English as expertly as Germans and Russians do and that therefore they should settle for the relaxed and clearly insulting goals of 'Japanese English', called by some foreign 'expert' advisers 'Japlish'. I was reminded of a seminar in Hachioji some eight years earlier when the same issue stimulated Clifford Prator to emerge in print again on the theme he had so forthrightly addressed in his 'heresy' paper (Prator 1978, cf. Prator 1968).

2.2 The restricted area. The other area of standards raised by the econocultural model I called 'restricted'. Here I seek to bring under one head such special uses of English as Soviet broadcasts to Third World countries, the English used in transnational corporations, the English used in the Asahi

Evening News, in service manuals for electronic equipment, in air navigation, and in such new communication systems as the Seaspeak devised by Strevens and his colleagues (cf Weeks et al. 1984). Of special interest here, and in my view of growing importance, is the irrelevance of a Landeskunde dimension. More than that: an American or British or Australian orientation is not just irrelevant, it is rightly felt to be undesirable. English for these purposes has to reflect not only what is going on in America and in Britain, but equally what is going on in Japan and the Soviet Union. English for these purposes has to be understood not only by Americans and Britons, but equally by English-speaking Japanese and Russians. In short, it is under this head that the motivation is strongest for the establishment of standards that are genuinely and usefully international (Cf Quirk and Stein, 1990).

3. The imperial model. Finally, I come to what I called the 'imperial' model of language spread, which shares with the econocultural one a lack of dependence on, or correlation with, population spread. This can be seen from the best-researched example of this model, India. The importance of English in India could not possibly be inferred from the statistics of those who use it: only about three percent of the population, even on a fairly liberal assessment (cf. Kachru 1986a, for example).² Numerous other languages in modern times have been spread by the imperial model (French is a particularly interesting example), but pressure of time restricts me to the discussion of English.

The working of the imperial model during the period of actual empire is clear enough. The Romans ran Britannia and Germania in Latin; the British ran Nigeria in English; the Germans ran Tanganyika in German. Local elites spoke the imperial language and became the more elite in so doing. When the Roman legions withdrew from Britannia and Germania, some place-names remained but, within a century, few other traces of Latin. When the Germans withdrew from Tanganyika in 1918, their linguistic footprints were obliterated with comparable rapidity and completeness. But counterexample: when the British legions withdrew from Lagos and Kaduna, did not English remain? To the extent that it is a counterexample (and as such, after all, it can be readily paralleled by French in nearby Côte d'Ivoire or Sénégal), there are several possible explanations. (1) English serves as an ethnically neutral link language between Ibo and Yoruba. (2) The British were in Nigeria longer than the Germans were in Tanganyika. (3) They evolved complex educational, administrative, and communicational structures--and, especially, they involved the indigenous population in running these systems. (4) English seems to the Nigerians to be a more useful language econoculturally in communication with the rest of the world than did German to the Tanganyikans (or Dutch to the Indonesians).

Such a range of possible explanations is not of mere academic interest, but of deep concern to the policymakers in Nigeria, to whom we, as linguists, must be ready to give competent advice. If a dispassionate needs analysis suggests that Nigeria's long-term interest in English is econocultural, like Japan's, then they need an international standard of English, and we have the problem of helping Nigeria to implement it and its consequences. If the needs analysis puts internal communication at the top of Nigeria's priority list, then we have a much bigger problem, for here alone is where the desirability and feasibility of a local standard arises, and its acquisition by a very large fraction of its population.

Now it is obviously controversial to call in question, as I have just appeared to do, 'the desirability and feasibility of a local standard' within the imperial model of linguistic spread. It may indeed seem to be flying in the face of established fact to question 'feasibility' when all of us here present have for years talked pretty freely of 'Nigerian English', 'West African English', 'South Asian English', 'Singaporean English',³ hypostatizing what remain at best rather general abstractions. What I believe to be a misleading, if not entirely false, analogy from designations like American English, or Iraqi Arabic, has of course been carried much further (as I have mentioned in connection with 'Japlish'), and the taxonomic implications are desperately different between 'computer English' (eg *English Today* 1.29), 'Queensland Kanaka English' (an area 'recently explored' in *English World-Wide*), 'Ashkenazic English' (*Am. Sp.* 60, 1985), 'Chicano English' and 'Anglo English' (both in Fernando Peñaloza 1980). As well as 'Black English', tout court, we have 'British Black English' (Ferguson and Heath 1981; Trudgill 1984). On the one hand, we can be told that the 'English of Quebec is a genre in its own right' (*English Today* 1.16); on the other, we can be invited (by Bokamba, in Kachru 1982: 78) to consider examples of what he calls 'African English' where little or no linguistic common ground is predicated, but only the anecdotal fact that all were written in Africa by black Africans. When, in his Foreword to Ferguson and Heath 1981, Hymes uses 'Indian English', it refers to North America and appears to cover the English used by, say, Cherokees in Oklahoma, Hopis in Arizona, Navahos in Utah, and it is not clear to me how far the designation seeks to capture linguistic features held in common.

But more usually, of course, 'Indian English' is applied, notably by Kachru, to the English used by the Indians of India, a variety, or set of varieties, or cline of varieties, more seriously studied than any other product of the imperial model of English spread. For Kachru, this is indeed part of a still broader variety which he calls 'South Asian English', in use, he says, by about 29 million people:⁴ 'My use of the term South Asian English', he explains (Kachru 1982), 'is not to be understood as indicative of linguistic homogeneity in this variety nor of a uniform competence. It refers to several broad regional varieties such as Indian English, Lankan English, and Pakistani English.' But within the regional variety,

Indian English, he makes an equal disclaimer of 'homogeneity' and 'uniform competence.' In his recent book The Alchemy of English (and I cannot forbear to recall that the medieval alchemists never did manage to turn copper into gold), he notes that 'Indian English maintains varying degrees of Englishness which is graded from pidgin to educated Indian English'. The fact that a similar situation obtains in other nonnative varieties of English produces a cline within each to complicate the differences between each. 'On the cline of Englishness these may be low', he concedes, but they exist, they work, and they call for the replacement of 'pedagogical models' that have become 'suspect'. Indeed, 'The pragmatics of the uses of the English language can be understood only if a dynamic polymodel approach is adopted' (Kachru 1986a; cf also Kachru 1983, 1985a, b, and c, 1986b).

We have a vision of education systems confronting a complexity undreamed of in Germany or Japan, where there is unquestioning acceptance of an external (i.e. native) standard for the teaching of English. And I wonder how realistic the vision is. How likely is it that a minister of education in Delhi or Lagos will provide resources for teaching to a model derived from nonnative norms--especially any that could be characterized as low on the cline of Englishness? It is not encouraging to reflect that, although Kachru has been publishing on Indian English for 25 years -- prolifically, eloquently, elegantly -- there is still no grammar, dictionary, or phonological description for any of these nonnative norms that is, or could hope to become, recognized as authoritative in India, a description to which teacher and learner in India could turn for normative guidance, and from which pedagogical materials could be derived.

If, of course, a national needs analysis in India, or Nigeria, or Singapore convinced ministers of education and other government colleagues that resources should be found for the promotion of nonnative norms low on the cline of Englishness, we might be in a different ballgame. But I see little sign of this. I had the privilege of speaking with Mrs Indira Gandhi only a few weeks before her death. She was caustic on what she saw as the declining standards of English in India and was horrified at the idea of India establishing its own standard. Alan Maley (English Today 1.32, 1985) has reported how Mrs Gandhi summoned her Minister of Education to complain after failing to understand the English of a fellow Indian at an international conference. The Prime Minister of Singapore has made it just as abundantly clear that his interest in English is to provide 'direct access to the knowledge and technology of the industrialized West' (Speeches 1.9, 1978), and for him the 'slovenly' use of a 'Singapore dialect English' will not serve.

In short, whatever uncertainties we may feel about the standards of and the needs for English as an intranational language, residually fulfilling the role of English in imperial times, we know that English continues to be desirable for the purposes of international access. But this is my econocultural model of language

- spread, and I believe it is as applicable in India, Singapore, and Nigeria as it is in Japan, Germany, and Russia. Indeed, this seems to be tacitly acknowledged in that those who speak of local norms always identify a desirable acrolectal one which bears a striking resemblance to the externally established norms of Standard English.

But, it may be objected, this is to ignore the distinction between English as a foreign language and English as a second language. I ignore it partly because I doubt its validity and frequently fail to understand its meaning. There is certainly no clear-cut distinction between ESL and EFL. Overtly, it is an instrumental distinction, but it is not applied to the highly instrumental use of English in (for example) air navigation; and in any case, is English used instrumentally and intranationally among Norwegians, Germans, Israelis less heavily than among Indians? And if so, is it more a difference of degree than of kind? Covertly, of course, the distinction has referred to the Commonwealth, and this is why India and Nigeria have been regarded as ESL countries but not Norway, Germany or Israel. In consequence, Strevens (1985) can refer in the same sentence to 'Educated West African', 'Educated Singaporean', and 'Educated Hong Kong' English--though on linguistic criteria English is surely a foreign language in Hong Kong, as it most certainly will be, institutionally, in ten years' time: probably far more so than in Malaysia, where the emphasis on promoting Bahasa with the New Economic Policy of 1970 entailed the official relegation of English from its 'second language' role.

Such changes do not apparently reduce the spread of English, but they change our perception of the English that is being spread, the purposes for which it is being spread, and the standards required in its spread. Moag's paper on the 'Life-cycle of non-native Englishes' (in Kachru 1982) contemplates the possibility of a contraction in the language spread that has proceeded from the imperial model, and this seems to me at least plausible. It is borne out in the same volume of papers edited by Kachru by the sobering reflections of Bokamba on English in Commonwealth Africa (cf. also Rogers 1982; Banjo 1985; Bailey 1990; Quirk 1990).

And this brings me back to the question of desirability of nonnative norms that I raised earlier (and have raised before: cf. Quirk 1983, 1985, 1986). If we accept with Kachru that the majority of India's 23 million English-users (or 28 million, according to his more recent estimate: Kachru 1987) have a norm that is low on the cline of Englishness; if we further assume success in the creation of a matching polymodel for pedagogical and other promotional purposes, who gains? There was a struggle in the United Nations about thirty years ago over a language policy for Papua New Guinea (Quirk 1972). Australia's policy was to institutionalize the native (pidgin) model because it seemed more democratic and because, after all, it was already there. In the UN this was condemned as neocolonialist, relegating an emergent people to a 'debased patois'.⁵ Australia

went ahead and the territory achieved its independence with Tok Pisin, as the language of parliament and administration. I was one who applauded the bold pragmatism. What I have heard and read in the past two or three years is less than reassuring. Tok Pisin is displaying gross internal instability and is being rejected in favour of an external model of English by those with power and influence (cf. Mühlhäusler 1986).

To sum up, we have looked at three models in terms of which human language may be spread. So far as English is concerned, it is to the econocultural model that we can attribute the remarkable degree of recent and current spread. As for countries affected by the imperial model, it is likely that a long-term demand for English will be related equally to econocultural factors, with consequences accordingly for the standards to be observed.

1. But it must not be exaggerated, as it sometimes is by enthusiasts for English who do damage alike to international relations and their own credibility as observers. In a recent lecture in Paris, John Honey raised eyebrows and hackles alike by predicting the replacement of French by English in France itself. Meanwhile, however, foreigners go on stubbornly using foreign languages and the losers are the Anglo-Saxons who stubbornly decline to learn them. It took NASA more than twenty years to learn of a vital ophthalmological discovery long familiar to German scientists who had read the work of Jörg Draeger (which was, of course, in German).

2. Nonetheless, the dissociation of the imperial model from demography in the present treatment may come as a surprise in view of some recent estimates of English users in the countries concerned. This is an area of linguistic crystal-gazing like that mentioned in relation to econocultural demand, where even the best-informed of colleagues have a tendency to go over the top. For Crystal (1985), 'There is a sense in which English is the language of most of the population of the sub-continent', and his table credits (for example) Pakistan with over 85 million, and India with a staggering 700 million speakers of English as a 'second language'.

3. In fact, such descriptions as exist suggest rather that this refers to common 'performance' features of the English attained by Chinese-speaking Singaporeans--rather than, say, the ethnic Indians of Singapore. This makes it difficult to distinguish in linguistic principle from the recognizable 'accent' remaining in the English learned by, say, Greeks or Germans.

4. Of which 23 million were estimated as being in India. Kachru has more recently put this Indian figure at 28 million (Kachru 1987), which entails his increasing South Asian English to at least 34 million. Kachru would accept of course that these numbers would include speakers of severely pidginized English (cf. Hymes 1971).

5. Cf., in a different context, Taylor (1985) pressing for better teaching of Standard English to speakers of 'Black English'.

References

- Bailey, R W and M Görlach, eds (1982). *English as a world language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bailey, R W (1990) English at its Twilight. In: C Ricks and L Michaels (eds), *The State of the Language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Banjo, A (1985). Issues in the teaching of English literature in Nigeria. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).
- Bokamba, E G (1982). The Africanization of English. In: Kachru (1982).
- Cazden, C B and D K Dickinson (1981). Language in education: Standardization vs cultural pluralism. In: Ferguson and Heath (1981).
- Crystal, D (1985). How many millions? The statistics of English today. *English Today* 1.7-9.
- Ferguson, C A and S B Heath, eds (1981). *Language in the USA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J A, ed (1974). *Advances in language planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J A (1982). Sociology of English as an additional language. In: Kachru (1982).
- Greenbaum, S ed (1985). *The English language today*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Guitarte, G L and R T Quintero (1974). Linguistic correctness and the role of the academies in Latin America. In: Fishman (1974).
- Hymes, D (1971). *Pidginization and creolization of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ibrahim, M H and B H Jernudd, eds (1986). *Aspects of Arabic socio-linguistics*, vol 60 of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Jernudd, B H ed (1986). *Chinese language planning*, vol 59 of *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.

- Kachru, B ed (1982). *The other tongue*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru B (1983). *The Indianization of English*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru B (1985a). Institutionalized second-language varieties. In: Greenbaum (1985: 211-26).
- Kachru B (1985b). Attitudes and usage: English in the world context. In: Greenbaum (1985: 207-10).
- Kachru B (1985c). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).
- Kachru B (1986a). *The alchemy of English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru B (1986b). ESP and non-native varieties of English. Mimeo.
- Kachru B (1987). The past and prejudice: Toward demythologizing the English canon. Mimeo.
- Kahane H (1986). A typology of the prestige language. *Lg* 62.495-508.
- Kahane H and R (1979). Decline and survival of Western prestige languages. *Lg* 55.183-98.
- Kuo, E C Y (1985). Languages and identity: The case of Chinese in Singapore. In: W Tseng and D Wu, eds, *Chinese culture and mental health*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lanham, L W (1982). English in South Africa. In: Bailey and Görlach (1982).
- Moag, R F (1982). The life cycle of non-native Englishes. In: Kachru (1982).
- Mühlhäusler, P (1986). English in contact with Tok Pisin. In: W Viereck and W D Bald, eds, *English in contact with other languages*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Peñalosa, F (1980). *Chicano sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, Mass: Newbury House.

- Prator, C H (1968). The British heresy in TESL. In: J A Fishman et al eds, *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Prator, C H (1978). The pronunciation of English as an international auxiliary language in Japan. *JACET Bulletin* 9.
- Quirk, R (1972). That's their pidgin. Chapter 6 of *The English language and images of matter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, R (1983). Language variety: Nature and art. In: R B Noss, ed *Varieties of English in S E Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Quirk, R (1985). The English language in a global context. In: Quirk and Widdowson (1985).
- Quirk, R (1986). Speculations on the future role of English in Hong Kong. In: V Bickley, ed, *Future directions in English language teacher education*. Hong Kong Education Department.
- Quirk, R (1990) Sound Barriers - Ten Years on. In: C Ricks and L Michaels (edd), *The State of The Language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Quirk, R and G Stein (1990) *English in Use*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R and H G Widdowson, eds (1985). *English in the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, J (1982). The world for sick proper. *ELT Journal* 36.144-57.
- Stevens, P (1985). Standards and the standard language. *English Today* 2.
- Taylor, O L (1985). Standard English as a second dialect? *English Today* 2.9-12.
- Trudgill, P ed (1984). *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weeks, F et al (1984). *Seaspeak reference manual*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.